

~~TOP SECRET~~

DUNNAN
Control System

1 March 1968

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: MOL Briefings for House Armed Services Committee
Members

On February 28, Colonel Floyd (SAFSL) and I visited Congressman Price (Chairman, House Armed Services R&D Subcommittee), Congressman Hall and Staff Counsel Earle Morgan to brief them on MOL per an earlier request from Chairman Rivers. Attached is a list of the briefing charts used. The session lasted approximately one hour (30 minutes briefing, 30 minutes discussion). The following were the major discussion items:

1. Schedule: In response to questions, I made quite clear that the camera was the pacing item, that EK was being funded to the maximum amount they could efficiently handle, and that the schedule probably could be advanced only a few months even if a great deal more money was placed on the program.
2. FY 69 Budget Request: I pointed out that the MOL Program had originally requested \$640 million for FY 69, and that in the budget process we had been "squeezed" to \$600 million; however, we considered this adequate even if very tight and felt we could "manage" so as not to have the reduction impact on our schedule.
3. Dependence on Orbital Workshop: I indicated we would test the MOL self-donning space suit, work restraints, and sleep station in the AAP Workshop, if possible, but that there was nothing in any NASA project to-day that was a critical fly-or-no-fly milestone for MOL.
4. Why EK a Covert Contractor: I touched on the security policy followed with regard to reconnaissance

DUNNAN
Control System

~~TOP SECRET~~

Page 1 of 2 pages
Copy 3 of 4 copies
SAFSL Control *Internal*

~~TOP SECRET~~

DUPLICATE
Handle via BYEMAN
Control System

satellites and pointed out that the identification of EK as a major MOL contractor would be tantamount to official confirmation of the MOL mission, that a covert status for EK had worked well for eight years, etc.

5. Other MOL Missions: I indicated that sea surveillance might be a possible future experimental task for MOL (using radar, smaller cameras, visual optics, real-time data relay, etc.); however, we had our hands full with the present mission and anything else was a future consideration.

6. MOL Priority in AF: I pointed out that MOL was more of a centrally-directed DoD effort than most AF programs, but that it enjoyed very high priority with both the SecAF and the C/S -- witness their efforts to insure it was funded properly despite its large dollar demands in a tight dollar situation.

7. MOL Discussions in HAS Full Committee Sessions: I indicated there were no DoD objections to discussing MOL in full committee sessions provided the questions did not probe into the reconnaissance mission or any aspects of the camera development, and in this regard we needed their help, etc.

The entire session was conducted in a very friendly session. I believe the three of them will support the MOL FY 69 budget request (no doubt whatsoever about Mr. Hall's strong support).

JAMES T. STEWART
Major General, USAF
Vice Director, MOL Program

2

Page 2 of 2 pages
Copy 2 of 4 copies
SAFSL Control *Internal*

~~TOP SECRET~~